

The Daily Era can be had every morning at the Periodical Stand of Mr. J. T. BATES, Exchange, Philadelphia; also, the Weekly Era.

Mr. JAMES ELLIOTT is authorized to receive and receipt for subscriptions and advertisements for the Daily and the Weekly National Era, in Cincinnati and vicinity.

## WASHINGTON, D. C.

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 15, 1864.

In an article yesterday, on "Protestant and Catholic Schools," we referred to a literary notice, which was crowded over till to-day.

### THE ISSUE.

The Washington Sentinel quotes the following paragraph from the Address of the Independent Democratic members of Congress, as defining the precise ground of opposition to the Nebraska Bill in its present form:

"We believe no permanent adjustment of that question possible, except by a return to that original policy of the fathers of the Republic, by which Slavery was restricted within State limits, and Freedom, without exception or limitation, was to be secured to every person outside of State limits, and under the exclusive jurisdiction of the General Government."

This paragraph may be considered, first, as asserting a fact—that it was the original policy of the fathers of the Republic, that "Slavery should be restricted within State limits, and Freedom be secured to every person outside of State limits, and under the exclusive jurisdiction of the General Government."

The Sentinel denies this, and attempts to disprove it by several considerations. We congratulate that journal upon its attempt to argue the real issue between the Pro-Slavery and Anti-Slavery men. True, its logic is not compact, and its argument is verbose and declamatory; but as it means to be argumentative, it deserves some attention.

In disproof of the assertion in the Address, it refers to the provisions of the Constitution in relation to the foreign slave trade, and to fugitives from service or labor, and the existence of Slavery among the Indian tribes.

"Does the assertion of the Address," it asks, "and countenance and support in the fact, that 'the fathers of the Republic' made the most careful provision to secure Slavery 'outside State limits,' by giving their sanction, countenance, and the national protection, to those ancestors of the present Free Soil party to make Slavery 'outside State limits,' and to bring them in those 'State limits' as slaves? The national flag, carrying with it 'the exclusive jurisdiction of the General Government,' waved its folds with sure protection over the decks of those vessels in which were those fathers from whose loins sprang the present Free Soil party, in their work of charity, in buying, capturing, and transporting slaves, from without 'State limits,' and acting according to the denunciations of their Free Soil children, 'the pimps and panders' to the more judicious slaveholder at home. The national flag, emblazoned with 'the exclusive jurisdiction of the General Government,' secured Slavery, without exception or limitation, to every negro 'outside of State limits,' who should fall into the hands of these 'ancestral pimps and panders' to the home purchasers of slaves. This was the 'policy of the fathers of the Republic,' as it was the 'practice' of the fathers of the Free Soil party."

Aside from the flummery of this paragraph, the point of the argument is this—that the foreign slave trade was sanctioned, countenanced, and protected, by the Federal Government, from the organization of the Constitution down to the year 1808—therefore it was not the policy of the fathers of the Republic to secure Freedom to every person outside of State limits, and under the exclusive jurisdiction of the Federal Government. A simple statement of facts will show the fallacy of this.

Under the Congress of the Confederation, the States had the power to regulate their trade with foreign nations. They levied imposts or duties, just as they pleased, provided they did not interfere "with any stipulation of treaties, entered into by Congress with any King, Prince, or State, in pursuance of any treaties already proposed by Congress to the Courts of France and Spain;" and the United States were prohibited from any act or treaty "whereby the legislative power of the respective States shall be restrained from imposing such imposts or duties on foreigners as their own people are subjected to, or from prohibiting the exportation or importation of any species of goods or merchandise whatsoever." They might tolerate or forbid the trade in slaves; allow or prohibit the migration or importation of any class of persons from abroad, at their pleasure.

In the Convention that framed the present Constitution, the power to regulate trade with foreign nations, after much deliberation, was transferred from the States to the United States; and it was the strong desire of the majority of the delegates, including those from Virginia and Maryland, to surrender to the United States the entire power over the migration or importation of persons from abroad. This was strenuously resisted by South Carolina and Georgia, until at last a compromise was proposed, which was sustained by delegates from the Eastern States, investing Congress with the power to pass navigation laws by a simple majority, and with the power to prohibit, in the year 1808, the migration or importation of such persons as the original States might think proper to admit prior to that time, and meanwhile to impose a tax on such importation, not exceeding ten dollars a head.

Before the adoption of the Federal Constitution, then, the United States had no power over the Slave trade. By the adoption of the Constitution, after a hard struggle, springing from the jealousy of South Carolina of the Federal power, the United States were invested with the authority to prohibit that trade in the year 1808, and to discourage it before that period. As a matter of fact, the power to discourage it was exercised the moment the new Government went into operation; by the year 1798, all the States had laws in force prohibiting the trade absolutely, and an act of Congress imposed the severest penalties for the infraction of those laws; and in 1808, so soon as the Constitution allowed, the United States enacted their famous law for the total suppression of the traffic.

This brief history demonstrates that it was not the policy "of the fathers of the republic" to "give their sanction, countenance, and the national protection" to the slave trade.

The Sentinel misrepresents the truth of history, and grossly libels their character. They secured by the Federal Constitution a power for Congress, to abolish the slave traffic, which it had never before possessed; and that this power could not be exercised till the year 1808, was the result of circumstances which they could not control, and proves nothing against the truth of the declaration of the Address, that their original policy was to secure freedom to every person "outside of State limits and within the exclusive jurisdiction of the Federal Government."

(Be it remembered here, that slaves imported into the State, prior to the year 1808, were not "within the exclusive jurisdiction of the Federal Government.")

The Sentinel follows up its fallacious statement, with an assertion, which we are glad to see made so boldly, as follows:

"And now, if a cargo of those 'chattels' be shipped at a port within State limits, and the 'floating territory' upon which they stand moves to the ocean, 'outside of State limits,' and bearing the flag, the evidence of the 'exclusive jurisdiction of the General Government,' they continue chattels, solely and exclusively by virtue of that very 'exclusive jurisdiction of the General Government,' which this Free Soil party allege 'secures freedom' emphatically. In both the former cases, it is the 'exclusive jurisdiction of the General Government' alone, which secures slavery on board this 'floating territory.'"

Mark—the Sentinel speaks of slaves as if they were named and treated in the Federal Constitution as chattels, or subjects of merchandise. He has no authority for this. Slaves are never mentioned or regarded in the Constitution as property. No provision in relation to them implies that they are property. There is not a word in that instrument which can be tortured into giving countenance to such an idea. If there be, produce it. Give us the article, the section, the clause. Stop your declamation, and submit the proof of your assumption. Repeatedly have the pro-slavery men been challenged on this point, but never have they responded. We defy the Sentinel to quote a single clause of the Federal Constitution authorizing it to regard or name slaves as chattels or property, when discussing their relations to the Federal Government.

But, let us examine its bold assertion. It is, that "slaves shipped at a port within State limits," and carried in an American vessel out upon the ocean, "outside of State limits," are not held as chattels in virtue of any State law, but only "in virtue of the exclusive jurisdiction of the General Government."

We thank the Sentinel for the important admission it makes. It involves a principle, fundamental in the creed of Independent Democracy—a principle of Natural Law, recognized and respected in the Constitution of the United States. That principle is, that Slavery, being against Natural Right, exists only as the creature of force, embodied in or recognized by positive statute, which has no operation beyond the jurisdiction of the Legislature enacting it. Upon this principle, a slave escaping from one sovereign nation into another, is exempt from recapture. An attempt to seize him and carry him back to the place whence he fled, would be not only an outrage on his right, but an affront to the sovereignty of the nation in which he has found refuge.

On this principle a slave escaping from Virginia into New York would be secure against recapture and seizure, but for a positive stipulation in the Federal Constitution in relation to fugitives from service or labor. On this principle, a slave carried by his master from Kentucky into Ohio, or permitted by him to go there, cannot be reclaimed or seized as a slave, the said stipulation being confined expressly to persons escaping from service in one State into another, where such service is not recognized—and not embracing persons held to service in one State, and placed by the voluntary act of their masters in another. On this principle, slaves shipped at Norfolk, Virginia, carried in an American vessel, on the ocean, outside of State limits, by the voluntary act of their masters, cease to be slaves, because, as the Sentinel admits, State jurisdiction does not extend beyond State limits—the laws of Virginia have no extra-territorial force.

But, at this point, the Sentinel meets us with the assertion, that such slaves, the moment they are carried "outside of State limits," are held as "chattels," in virtue of the exclusive jurisdiction of the General Government—"it is the exclusive jurisdiction of the Federal Government alone which secures Slavery on board this floating territory."

Has the Sentinel analyzed the bearings of this assumption? Is it willing to abide by its consequences, admitting for the sake of argument that it is true? If it be true, what becomes of the Sentinel's favorite policy of Non-Interference by Congress in relation to Slavery? The General Government is a slaveholder—the People of the United States, whose agent it is, are slaveholders. The General Government and the People of the free States are habitually guilty of intervention in regard to Slavery, which the Sentinel and its pro-slavery associates insist should be entirely withdrawn from Federal action! This is not all. If the General Government can intervene in behalf of Slavery, it can intervene against it. If intervention by the General Government alone secures Slavery on board of American vessels, carrying slaves on the high seas from one slaveholding port to another, then, if withdrawn, Slavery ceases, and the slaves are free; and that it ought to be withdrawn, the advocates of the policy of Non-Interference are bound to admit. If they will not do this, if they will insist that the Federal Government should continue that intervention, by which alone Slavery is secured in American vessels on the high seas, with what consistency or decency can they denounce as unconstitutional the policy of intervention by the Government, when it is directed to prohibit Slavery on land belonging to the United States?

The question arises, Is the assumption true? The only provision in the Constitution of the United States which has ever been claimed to apply to slaves "outside of State limits," is the clause relating to fugitives from service or labor. This applies, as we have said, only to fugitives, and to fugitives escaping from one State into another. Of course, it has nothing to do with persons held to service or labor under the laws of a State, shipped through the voluntary act of the master, and sent out upon the high seas, beyond State limits. If there be any constitutional provision in virtue of which slaves so shipped are held as such, on the high seas, let the Sentinel point it out. Even the attempt to do this has never yet been made.

We are obliged to defer the rest of the argument till to-morrow.

### For the National Era.

#### KOSUTH IN LONDON.

BY ISAAC H. JULIAN.

Linger in London, Hungary's and Chief, True in the trial as the triumph hour: Mightier Prometheus of a greater grief, Bears nobly up 'neath Fortune's fellest power.

Where headless flows the tide of common life, Save a few friends, the partners of his woes, The unenvied slander, or the assassin's knife, Only may mar his love, constrained repose.

Oh, God! the crushing weight his soul must bear, With only hope to comfort or ally! A homeless exile, yet a Nation's care, Rests on his steadfast mind from day to day.

Yet is he firm, as only Right is firm; A veteran in Virtue's changeful war; Still throbs his heart with its high purpose warm, And still his "watchings" weary every star.

Along with God, or "mid the city fill," He ponders Universal Freedom still, With fervid soul Misfortune cannot dull, Hope and Devotion bearing up the Will!

And hence it is, though lost to action thus, That tyrants fear his name the world around; And hence it is that his name is glorious, Shrieked in the People's heart of hearts profound!

That Hungary feels it course through all her veins, That Europe owns it as a household word, That great Columbia, through her wide domains, Feels by it Freedom's latent pulses stirred.

I scarce can brook the idle joys of Earth; Her sordid tumults grate upon my ear; I deem her prate of Freedom little worth, While her true prophet pines for earth's here!

Scourged by oppression, fettered and betrayed, Hath Europe, then, no need of such a man? Still will she scorn her best deliverer's aid, While all her tyrants hold him under ban?

Oh, righteous Heaven! we invoke the day, When, as his voice thrilled o'er land and sea, His word may flash avenging Freedom's way, A beacon to the world of Liberty!

\* Written last autumn, while he yet remained there.

### REVIEWS.

HELEN MULOVAR, ON JESUIT EXERCITATIONS. 1 vol. Pp. 312. Published by De Witt & Davenport, Nassau street, New York. Sold by Gray & Ballantyne, Washington.

Seldom have we read a work of such absorbing interest, describing, as it does, the process by which a young inquiring mind is led to cast off the formula of the Catholic faith, in which it was trained, and the persecutions to which it is in consequence subjected, extending through every relation of life.

The book contains many truths of vital importance.

THE CONVENT AND THE MANSE. By Hyla. Boston: John P. Jewett & Co. Cleveland: Jewett, Proctor, & Worthington. Sold by Gray & Ballantyne, Washington. 1 vol. Pp. 242.

We are here presented with a delightful picture of a clergyman's home—a home where intelligent industry presides, and governed by the sweet law of love; where the heart is free as mountain winds to gush forth in loving words and deeds, or in merry play with the happy spirits that surround it—a little heaven; not the heaven where no sorrow is, but where it comes as a ministering angel to turn the thoughts more trustfully upward, and make the tried and purified spirit beam with a more heavenly lustre. Perhaps the author is a clergyman's wife, and her own home sat for the portrait. If so, we envy its inmates, one and all—from the happy husband down to the Irish servant girl.

In strong contrast is presented the life of a convent, where the glad gushings of the heart of youth are represented as fettered by unnatural restrictions. The author arraigns those parents who, to gratify a selfish ambition, and gain political influence, send their daughters away from free and happy homes, where they have been tenderly reared by the hand of maternal love, and shut them up within gloomy walls, where, he says, they are subject to the artful persuasions and insidious teachings of Jesuits and Sisters, misnamed of Mercy. He holds that forbidden to think, to judge, to act for themselves, it is impossible that their minds should be thoroughly disciplined and sound where free discussion and inquiry are encouraged; and hence that they are more readily receive the specious falsehoods and complicated dogmas taught them for truth. To believe and obey is their duty, and not to reason and reflect. Consequently, they soon learn to consider their parents heretics, and in the end fall into the arms of "Holy Mother Church."

LIBERAL FEELINGS AT WHEELING, VA.—We learn that Mr. Greeley, of the New York Tribune, who lectured at Wheeling a few evenings since, created some sensation, if not by his lecture, at least by the simple fact of his presence. The Wheeling Times says of him:

"No man regretted more than we did the accidental advent of Horace Greeley to our city, and no one has a more abiding dislike of every act with which he has been connected than we. He is a disorganizer of the worst order, the advocate of the worst aims ever invented in any country, opposed to the Union, and possessed of no one characteristic, excepting energy and intellect, which is congenial to us and to Virginia. We did not hear him, did not even notice the fact that he spoke here, and sincerely hope that he may never again darken our soil with his presence. His lecture, we learn, was an able one, and purely literary, and we are well assured that his usual current of lectures would not have been tolerated for an instant by his auditory."

Bah, Mr. Times! Don't betray your folly so freely; the world will discover it in good time without any direct efforts on your part to illustrate it.

THE COMMITTEE of the House of Representatives appointed to inquire "how far it is expedient for the public interest, and consistent with our civil institutions, to employ military men on our public works," consists of Messrs. Stanton, of Kentucky, chairman; Dawson, of Pennsylvania; Dickinson, of Massachusetts; Faulkner, of Virginia; Vanant, of Maryland; Sapp, of Ohio; and Keitt, of South Carolina.

### EXTRACTS FROM OUR CORRESPONDENCE.

St. Louis, Feb. 7, 1864.

I have clipped a short article from the Evening Nebraska question, you have seen here on the Nebraska question. With only one exception, the press in St. Louis is opposed to Douglas's bill, or in any way disturbing the Missouri Compromise. If the People are aroused in time, the bill cannot pass. I believe that the only friends of the bill here are the revilers of Col. Benton, and they favor it more out of hatred to him than from any other cause, promising that he will cast his influence against it.

MARTIN'S FERRY, O., Feb. 8, 1864.

A petition against the pro-slavery clause of the Nebraska bill, now before Congress, is circulating and obtaining the signatures of almost all to whom it is offered; but the people everywhere feel much more than they express upon this subject. So little has heretofore been effected in staying the encroachments of Slavery by public meetings and petitions, that a strong determination is felt by many to make themselves heard in a more effectual manner.

any of Ohio's representatives are so lost to virtue and honor as to be willing to sustain that odious clause in the bill, let them count the cost. Their reward will be political death, and a name hereafter that their descendants will blush to own, or I am no prophet. And let the South beware, lest they find that, contrary to all former indications, the North has yet a conscience, and a deep-seated abhorrence of oppression, slumbering though it has been beneath the obscurity of a misguided and mistaken selfishness. When conscience, the love of liberty, and the omnipotent dollar, are on one side, they may awake and shake from their limbs the fetters that Slavery has hung about them to retard their progress.

LEE, MAINE, Feb. 8, 1864.

I am glad you give so much attention to the Nebraska question. The people are waking up. I have not found a Whig or Democrat who is not opposed to Douglas's bill.

For the National Era.

### THE LEGAL TENURE OF SLAVERY.

LETTER X.

COLONIAL AND SUBSEQUENT LEGISLATION FAILED TO REALIZE SLAVERY—TESTIMONY OF SLAVEHOLDING JURISTS.

[CONCLUDED.]

To the Friends of American Liberty:

The language and the course of Judge Matthews may remind one of an expression used by the celebrated Dr. Hopkins, who, in his writings, charges the "convinced" with "convincing at the practice" of slaveholding. This meaning is evident from the consideration that magistrates are never said to "convince" at what is legal. Dr. Hopkins expresses himself in accordance with this, when he says, further, that our modern Slavery differs from the ancient, as being "without the express sanction of civil Government." Judge Matthews cannot

"History of Slavery and Anti-Slavery," p. 76, be cleared from the charge of "convincing" at the practice, though he had too much intelligence and decency to pronounce it legal.

In the case of *Hudgins vs. Wright*, November term, 1808, the Court said: "The Slavery of the African negro has existed from the time of bringing them into the colony. In many of the States, express enactments have been made, declaring them slaves; in others, they are slaves by custom."—1. Henry and Munford's Virginia reports, 139; Wheeler's Law of Slavery, p. 12; Goodell's American Slave Code, p. 263.

This falls short of affirming the legality of Slavery in any of the States, and amounts to an implication that it is legal in some of them. No one doubts that Slavery has existed from the period specified. So has petty larceny and many other unlawful practices. And the "express enactments" alluded to are not shown, nor even affirmed, to have been valid.

"In other (States) they are slaves by custom," that is, without the existence of "express statutes" or positive law; and, consequently, their slavery is illegal. In the case of *Hall vs. Mullen*, June Term, 1821, Judge Johnson said: "But the condition and rights of slaves in this State depend not exclusively on the civil or feudal law, but may, perhaps, rest upon both; subject, nevertheless, to such changes in their condition, &c., as the laws of the State may prescribe."—5 Har. & John's Maryland Reports, 190; Wheeler, p. 10, 11; Slave Code, p. 264.

Now, again, we have the same weak and unscientific search after the legal foundations and origin of Slavery. No mention is made of "municipal law"—"the laws of the State"—as having originated or legalized the relation, but only as regulating and changing its incidents. The Judge knew better than to attempt citing either the Statutes or the Constitution of Maryland, for the origin or legality of Slavery. He knew that, at the treaty of Paris, by his firmness, he had secured the right of the United States to the territory of the old Roman province of Virginia, and to the feudal law (existing in Europe, but never in America) for their origin. Nothing of "local, municipal, positive law," can be predicated of these; and, consequently, nothing that could legalize Slavery. "The creature only of municipal law. After all, the Judge finds that Slavery cannot 'depend exclusively either on the civil or feudal law,' yet he consoles himself with the thought that 'perhaps, new law, in part, of the State, has existed from the time of its origin, in which the original law, as it were, is still to be seen.'"

I shall cite but one instance more. In the case of *The State vs. Waggoner*, April Term, 1797, the Judge said: "They (Indians) have so long been recognized as slaves in our law, that it would be as great a violation of the rights of property to establish a contrary decision at the present day, as it would in the case of the Africans, and as useless to investigate the law in which their original right to their freedom."—1 Halsted's New Jersey Reports, 374-478; Am. Slave Code, p. 265.

In this New Jersey decision, the more liberal and righteous doctrine of the Southern Courts, "that prescription is never pleadable to a claim for freedom," is entirely set aside. Prescription, or length of time, is made the only foundation of Slavery. It is said of statutes, laws, constitutions, commissions, or understandings of any kind—nothing in the shape of "local, municipal, or positive law," in any possible form. The plain, unvarnished proposition is this: That long-continued practices, whatever they may be, are entitled to protection, and constitute law, unless special statutes abolish them. If this be so, then "legal custom," "common law," and so forth, are mere phrases without any real meaning.

My main object in this letter was to show that there were no statutes creating the relation of Slavery during the colonial period. I have proved more than this, by the testimony of slaveholding jurists themselves, one of whom testifies that there were no such statutes in 1797, and the other, that none could be found in 1817. In the proper place I shall produce further testimony from slaveholding jurists, and from the Federal Courts, affirming or admitting that no such statutes could be found in 1850 and 1853. But I must first show the illegality of Slavery from considerations and evidences of a different character and earlier date.

WILLIAM GOODELL.

THE MAYORALTY OF PHILADELPHIA.—The present Mayor, Gilpin, George M. Dallas, S. Austin Allibone, Major Fritz, N. B. Browne, James P. Johnston, J. C. Montgomery, James Page, and others, have already been named as candidates for this office, the dignity of which has been greatly enhanced by the extension of the city limits. It is to be hoped no party machinery may be applied in this municipal election. The interests of so great a city are too important to admit of any folly of this kind, without the infliction of great injury.

REV. MR. MILBURN.—We perceive that this gentleman, the present Chaplain of the House of Representatives, is announced to lecture in New England in the latter part of this month. Mr. Milburn, a New York paper remarks, is one of the most living speakers in the country, and when in New York lately was listened to with pleasure and profit.

MARYLAND SENATOR.—The Hon. James A. Pearce was yesterday re-elected a Senator in Congress by the Legislature of Maryland, for the term of six years from the 4th of March, 1865, when his present term of service will expire. The vote was—for Mr. Pearce, 58; Mr. Constable, (Dem.) 35; and scattering, 2.

MASSACHUSETTS ON THE NEBRASKA BILL.—The House of Representatives of this State yesterday passed the resolves in opposition to the Nebraska bill, by a vote of 246 yeas to 13 nays, eleven Democrats and two Whigs voting in the negative. So the spirit of justice and of freedom have not yet been "crushed out" of the freemen of this noble old Commonwealth!

MR. BURLINGAME'S SPEECH ON THE MISSISSIPPI VALLEY.

The following are the closing words of Mr. Burlingame's lecture upon the Valley of the Mississippi, which were received with such favor last Wednesday evening at the Mercantile, in Boston:

At the time of the adoption of the Constitution, there was not one State in the Valley of the Mississippi, nor one third of the States of the Confederacy were there, containing nearly one half of the people of the Republic. Six of them are dedicated to Freedom; six are lost to Slavery. Missouri, Kentucky, and Tennessee, on the confines of Freedom, may yet cast out the evil. Arkansas, Mississippi, and Louisiana, have a dreary prospect before them. No settler will set his feet within their borders.

Civilization flees their borders, and the Old Dominion, the seat of the great American Republic, is fast becoming a vast wilderness of physical as well as moral power, for a *coup d'état* to be enduringly successful. Such affairs require the hand of a Napoleon, sustained by a great name and a great army. Without these, the little man cannot violate ordinary decencies, or insult and outrage statement of ability and long service. Such things were scarcely tolerated in the darkest days of Spanish history. They will never do so in this nineteenth century, and we shall expect to hear soon of some of the great names of the world, as they were in Spain.—Philadelphia *Ev. Bulletin*.

MAINE SENATOR.—Why was Mr. Fessenden elected? The *State of Maine*, a Portland print, says:

"We understand, from unquestionable authority, that the vote in the Legislature of Maine, in the choice of a United States Senator, was very largely influenced by the position of the Nebraska bill, now pending before Congress. In fact, this question very naturally and very properly absorbs or overrides the ordinary topics of party warfare, and is soon to be made the leading question, if not the great question of the day. On this matter Mr. Fessenden was known to occupy no doubtful position, but was heartily and resolutely committed against the breaking up or disturbance of the Missouri Compromise. On the other hand, Mr. Morrill hesitated, or declined to commit himself against it."

MR. CHASE made in the Senate, yesterday, a most powerful reply to the sophistical ploy of Mr. Douglas in favor of admitting Slavery into Nebraska. He thoroughly exposed the novelty of the plan of repealing the Missouri Compromise, and proved conclusively that the arguments of Mr. Douglas were not only of recent invention, and were unknown even to him so late as the 24th of January last, but that all his ideas and all the notions of the Democratic party and the Southern party leaders were, until then, utterly foreign to such a scheme.

The history of the day, Mr. Douglas was assisted with equal cogency. We do not remember a speech of greater logical ability and compactness than this, nor one of a more dignified and weighty style. Its effect in setting right the convictions of the public, and lending strength to the antagonism excited by this nefarious plot, cannot but be great and lasting.

MR. CHASE made in the Senate, yesterday, a most triumphant answer to the arguments presented by Mr. Douglas on Monday last.

By far the most numerous audience of the season listened to Mr. Chase's speech. The galleries and lobbies were densely crowded an hour before the debate began, and the ladies even crowded into, and took possession of, one of the lobby seats on the floor of the Senate. It is not often that the lobby seats are so thoroughly represented. The entire audience—both of Senators and spectators, with the exception of two or three Southern fathers, who have nothing more to learn from mortal men—listened to Mr. Chase's arguments with most profound attention. The crowded galleries and the marked attention indicate one of two things—either that the subject of debate attracts far more of public interest than the authors of the measure profess to believe, or else that the people have become more ready to listen to the peculiar views of which Mr. Chase is supposed to be an exponent. I have no doubt the former of these points is the true one, for upon this bill the Senator from Ohio expresses sentiments which are held by hundreds of thousands who acknowledge no sympathy with his general political position.—Cor. N. Y. Times, Feb. 4.

PHOTOGRAPHY.—The merits of this new mode of writing are but little understood in this community. Some, who have heard of it as a means of reporting, suppose that its usefulness is confined to that object alone. But its capacity, as we believe, fits it for use in every department in which writing is needed; and in time it must become (as it may seem) the universal mode of recording thought; and for the same reason that the railroad is now so generally used, viz: economy of time and labor.

When compositors, as well as editors and reporters become familiar with this art, so that the type can be set up from the photographic manuscript, its usefulness will be invaluable. This, we understand, is already the case in the office of the *Evangelical Repository*, the editor of which has used photography for several years. This gentleman, who is also pastor of a Presbyterian church, states that his services are written exclusively in that hand, and that he has no more difficulty in reading it than in reading the common long hand.

### FURTHER ITEMS BY THE AFRICA.

TURKEY AND RUSSIA.—All accounts concur in stating that Russia is making extensive preparations on the Danube, as also in Asia. Omar Pasha was vigorously engaged in recruiting and strengthening his position. Every opportunity within his reach was embraced for this purpose.

The Shah of Persia has promised neutrality towards Turkey.

Hungary.—Affairs in this country have been very much agitated. There were indications of an outbreak, and apprehensions of an outbreak of difficulty. The whole tenor of the news is warlike.

France.—Extensive defensive and warlike preparations were still going on. Napoleon is understood, says the *Constitutionelle*, to be determined upon war, unless the Czar comes to some terms in due time.

England.—The war question is still absorbing all interests, and viewed by the best informed as extremely uncertain. England continues to strengthen her land and naval forces. The imports of breadstuffs into England were large, but the demand almost equal to the supply.

The inquiries during the week were more numerous, and had led to a large general business at improved prices. The chief transactions were in United States Federal stocks, Pennsylvania bonds, and New Orleans 6 percent bonds.

SPAIN.—The scandals of the Spanish Court have been the theme of gossip for months, and the young Queen has been charged with irregularities such as have rendered Spanish Queens of former times infamous in history. Even the legitimacy of the late Infanta has been doubted, and her death, when a few days old, while it enlarged the sphere of gossip, excited no regret among the people. Indeed, the event was the occasion of displaying about Madrid placards in reference to the Queen, in which there was more truth than decency.

Queen Isabella is indeed fast hurrying into all those excesses, political as well as moral, that usually mark the career of weak women, placed in prominent positions, and infatuated with a favorite lover. Her improprieties have excited the people. Her ministers and most devoted servants have remonstrated with her, and, having lost the affection of her subjects, she attempts to enforce submission and compel allegiance. Accordingly she has exiled General Concha and O'Donnell, formerly two of the ablest and bravest of her subjects, and several others, to whom she is in a great measure indebted for the preservation of her crown. Their offence was their too high sense of morality, and their opposition to the scandalous royal intrigue. No one can suppose that such a high-handed measure can succeed in crushing the rebellious feeling of the people.

Isabella the Second is too weak in her own character, and her Government is too destitute of physical as well as moral power, for a *coup d'état* to be enduringly successful. Such affairs require the hand of a Napoleon, sustained by a great name and a great army. Without these, the little man cannot violate ordinary decencies, or insult and outrage statement of ability and long service. Such things were scarcely tolerated in the darkest days of Spanish history. They will never do so in this nineteenth century, and we shall expect to hear soon of some of the great names of the world, as they were in Spain.—Philadelphia *Ev. Bulletin*.

MAINE SENATOR.—Why was Mr. Fessenden elected? The *State of Maine*, a Portland print, says:

"We understand, from unquestionable authority, that the vote in the Legislature of Maine, in the choice of a United States Senator, was very largely influenced by the position of the Nebraska bill, now pending before Congress. In fact, this question very naturally and very properly absorbs or overrides the ordinary topics of party warfare, and is soon to be made the leading question, if not the great question of the day. On this matter Mr. Fessenden was known to occupy no doubtful position, but was heartily and resolutely committed against the breaking up or disturbance of the Missouri Compromise. On the other hand, Mr. Morrill hesitated, or declined to commit himself against it."

MR. CHASE made in the Senate, yesterday, a most powerful reply to the sophistical ploy of Mr. Douglas in favor of admitting Slavery into Nebraska. He thoroughly exposed the novelty of the plan of repealing the Missouri Compromise, and proved conclusively that the arguments of Mr. Douglas were not only of recent invention, and were unknown even to him so late as the 24th of January last, but that all his ideas and all the notions of the Democratic party and the Southern party leaders were, until then, utterly foreign to such a scheme.

The history of the day, Mr. Douglas was assisted with equal cogency. We do not remember a speech of greater logical ability and compactness than this, nor one of a more dignified and weighty style. Its effect in setting right the convictions of the public, and lending strength to the antagonism excited by this nefarious plot, cannot but be great and lasting.

MR. CHASE made in the Senate, yesterday, a most triumphant answer to the arguments presented by Mr. Douglas on Monday last.

By far the most numerous audience of the season listened to Mr. Chase's speech. The galleries and lobbies were densely crowded an hour before the debate began, and the ladies even crowded into, and took possession of, one of the lobby seats on the floor of the Senate. It is not often that the lobby seats are so thoroughly represented. The entire audience—both of Senators and spectators, with the exception of two or three Southern fathers, who have nothing more to learn from mortal men—listened to Mr. Chase's arguments with most profound attention. The crowded galleries and the marked attention indicate one of two things—either that the subject of debate attracts far more of public interest than the authors of the measure profess to believe, or else that the people have become more ready to listen to the peculiar views of which Mr. Chase is supposed to be an exponent. I have no doubt the former of these points is the true one, for upon this bill the Senator from Ohio expresses sentiments which are held by hundreds of thousands who acknowledge no sympathy with his general political position.—Cor. N. Y. Times, Feb. 4.

PHOTOGRAPHY.—The merits of this new mode of writing are but little understood in this community. Some, who have heard of it as a means of reporting, suppose that its usefulness is confined to that object alone. But its capacity, as we believe, fits it for use